THE

UNITARIAN.

No. 4. April, 1846. Vol. I.

UNITARIANISM *versus* TRINITARIANISM:— SCRIPTURE EVIDENCE.

In our last number we promised to discuss in this, those other passages of Scripture which seemed to imply, if not to state, a Trinity in the Godhead, beside the one we there touched upon, and whose spuriousness has been proved beyond the possibility of further cavil; namely, the text of the three Heavenly Witnesses, (1 John v. 7.) In the endeavour to fulfil our expressed intention, we have found, that in order to do thorough justice to so ample, comprehensive, and multifarious a subject, we must take a much wider circumference of scope than the pages of a small periodical like this will at all warrant or admit of. We are inevitably compelled, therefore, to confine our views within comparatively narrow limits; and where our observations cannot be fully expository, to make them merely suggestive. But, perhaps, as little is gained to the Unitarian cause by going over ground on which Trinitarians themselves willingly accompany us, it may be as well, in this short essay, to circumscribe our aim for the most part, or as much as may be, to that which more immediately relates to what are, strictly and properly, the peculiarities of Unitarianism, or, in other words, the *precise points of difference* between it and Trinitarianism. By thus limiting the discussion we may very probably, indeed, be consulting the wishes of our more candid opponents, and may thus attract to our remarks a greater share of their attention than by travelling over less relevant ground.

On this point, and in confirmation of the above, Dr. Wardlaw, in his reply to Mr. Yates's *Vindication of*

Unitarianism, observes, "that all evidence is irrelevant and inadmissible that does not immediately relate to what are, strictly and properly, the *peculiarities* of Unitarianism, the *precise points of difference*. To set about proving the *Divine Unity*, for example, is to do a service to Trinitarians, as well as to *Unitarians*. It is an article of faith which is held by both; and the former will be as highly gratified as the latter, by the excellence and conclusiveness of the reasoning by which it is established. There may be some diversity of opinion respecting the degree of certainty with which the doctrine may be learned by the light of nature: but in the doctrine itself, that GOD IS ONE, as a doctrine fully certified by revelation, and according with every principle of enlightened reason, there is perfect agreement. The harmony on this point between my opponent and myself, will most satisfactorily appear from a comparison of our respective language." The Doctor then quotes in proof of this statement from his own Discourses, and Yates's *Vindication*, and afterwards proceeds thus: "Whatever difference might arise between us upon an explanation of the terms of the last sentence, it is obvious, that in the sentiment that the unity of God is an important truth, and a leading doctrine of revelation, we are one. What, then, is the precise point at issue? It is simply this—both parties hold the unity of God. But Trinitarians maintain that, according to the Scriptures, this unity is, in a way which is not explained, and which they do not therefore pretend to understand, consistent with *personal distinction*. Unitarians deny that any such distinction of persons is taught in the Scriptures. The point, therefore, which it behoves them to establish is, not *the unity of God*, but simply the inconsistency of this unity with the personal distinction for which Trinitarians contend:—or, in other words, that this doctrine of personal distinction has no place in the word of God. All argument and discussion that are not confined to *this one point*, are entirely irrelevant to the question."

Though we shall endeavour to comply with the suggestions contained in this passage, we have one or two remarks to make in reference to it, before we proceed with our design.

It is then admitted by Trinitarians themselves, accord-

ing to the above reverend writer, that God is one; but that in this Unity there is a Trinity of persons, or subsistences, or essences. Now, this latter position Unitarians deny, and maintain that the Unity is taught alone, and stands prominently forth *by itself*, as a distinguishing doctrine of the Scriptures; nor are the passages adduced in support of it "irrelevant to the question." But while Trinitarians admit that "there is but one living and true God," do they affirm that the "one God" is the Father, and that the Father alone is the "one God?" No; for, say the Trinitarians (*vide* the Creed of *St. Athanasius*), "the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God; and yet there are not three Gods but one God." The conclusion is, that the Father is not the only God. But Unitarians assert that he is. This constitutes the precise ground of difference. Hence the appeal must lie to the testimony of the Scriptures, and to this the Trinitarian cannot object, inasmuch as in the sixth article of the Church of England, we read—"Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that *whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.*"

But first, a few words on the Athanasian Creed. This system of belief is supposed by the compilers of the Church of England Liturgy to contain a true explication of the doctrine of the Trinity; and that this doctrine and the way of worship founded upon it, are derived from, and owe all their support to, the sole authority of revelation. But it will be evident to the most superficial observer, that the doctrine of the Trinity, as set forth in this Creed, is not delivered in the words of Scripture: there are no such propositions to be found in the declarations of Christ and his apostles. The language of the Athanasian Creed does not appear in the New Testament. The propositions therein contained must, therefore, undeniably be the work of some other man or men; and all consistent Protestants have a right to demand a good account given of them, before they receive such mysterious propositions as articles of faith, lest they should embrace the inventions of men instead of the mysteries of God. The composition of this belief is, indeed, generally attributed to Athanasius,

but we believe it has been satisfactorily proved that he was not the author of it. However that may be, an objector might here reply, that "though the express words of Scripture are perhaps not to be found in that Creed, yet this ought not to be sufficient to condemn it, unless it also evidently contradicts the connected sense and plain tenor of the sacred writings: the question, therefore, is, whether that Creed contains the genuine doctrine of the Scriptures, according to their true sense and meaning?" Now, to this question, which has been frequently put, we beg to reply in the words of one who styles himself a "member of the Church of England, sincerely attached to her true interest," the late Rev. Mr. Hopkins, of Cuckfield:—"The declarations of the Athanasian Creed," says he, "when compared with those of Scripture, are so far from being found there, that they seem at first view to convey a sense in opposition to that of the sacred writers. There are several propositions in this famous Creed, that appear shocking to common sense, and seem contradictory to each other, as well as Scripture. The language of the New Testament upon the subject of the Trinity, conveys a clear, rational, and consistent sense: but the same doctrine, as set forth in the Athanasian Creed, is all confusion and self-inconsistency: and, consequently, a Christian can be under no obligation to express his faith in such contradictory and unscriptural expressions, which do not seem calculated to clear up a Scripture doctrine, but to darken and confound the faith once delivered to the saints. I must beg leave to remind you, that it is not consistent with the character of a sincere Christian to contend for the imposition of such a Creed upon the consciences of Christians, as it is evidently needless from your own concession, namely, that the expressions in it are not found in Scripture. Can a sincere Christian possibly think, that a doctrine of revelation can be better expressed by men fallible, interested, and contentious, than by the Apostles themselves, to whom it was revealed by the Spirit of God, and who *alone* had a commission from God to deliver it to mankind whole and undefiled? Is not this in effect to declare that the language of the Holy Spirit was insufficient to set forth a doctrine fully and completely, without the assistance of new and obscure terms of art, invented by men? Though a Christian has

certainly a right to reject such an unscriptural Creed, without a formal examination; yet I am willing to give it all the fair play its warmest advocates can desire. Let it not be absolutely rejected, unless it contradicts Scripture in sense as well as language."

The same writer proceeds in an elaborate work to prove (and from the success and celebrity of that work, it would appear that his positions and arguments were exceedingly powerful)that it does contradict Scripture in sense as well as in language. We must refrain from following him, however, and apply ourselves more closely to the main design of this paper.

One of the main bulwarks of Trinitarianism is the passage of Matthew xxviii. 19: "Go ye, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the *Father*, and of the *Son*, and of the *Holy Ghost*." It cannot, however, we think, be justly contended that this text either expresses or implies the mysterious doctrine attributed to it. Baptism is a simple rite, not an act of religious worship; and is expressive merely of *belief* and obedience. Thus, St. Paul speaks (1. Cor. x. 1, 2.) of the Israelites being baptized unto Moses, namely, into a belief of his Divine commission. And again, in the Acts (xix. 2, 3.) we read of the followers of John being baptized unto his baptism, that is, they professed to be his disciples.

St. Paul thanked God that he had baptized only two persons, lest any should say that he had baptized in his own name (1. Cor. i. 13—15). In another place, he intimates that all who were baptized into Jesus Christ were also baptized into his death (Rom. vi. 3, 4.): not that the death of their Master was an object of worship, (which would be absurd,)but a subject of belief. Hence we infer, that the ceremony of baptism is not indicative of *religious worship*, being due to the person or thing in whose name it is administered; but we agree with Locke, who defines the phrase "*to be baptized into any one's name*, or *into any one*, as solemnly by that ceremony entering himself a disciple of him into whose name he was baptized, with profession to receive his doctrine and rules and submit to his authority."

The attempt of Dr. Adam Clarke to deduce the doctrine of the Trinity from this passage of Matthew, on the position that "baptism signifies a full and eternal con-

secration of the person to the service and honour of that *Being* in whose name it is administered, but this consecration can never be made to a *creature*," seems beside the mark, or made without due consideration; for, surely, from the passages above cited we are authorised to reply, that "Moses" was a "*creature*;" John and Paul were "*creatures*;" the "*body*" of Christians spoken of (i. Cor. xii. 13.) is composed of innumerable "*creatures*;" and "baptism" and "death," if not *qualities*, are certainly not Divine persons in the Godhead. Moreover, it is distinctly declared that "God's dear Son" is "the first-born of every *creature*." (Col. i. 13—15).

Our limits will not allow us to dwell much further on this passage than merely to state our conclusion, and one corroborative fact. We conclude, then, both for the reasons assigned, and others which we have not room to adduce, that the formula of baptism delivered by our Saviour in this text contains no allusion whatever to the popular doctrine of the Trinity; and this opinion is confirmed by finding that the Apostles did not employ the *precise* words of their Master, but omitted the names of the Father and the Spirit. Thus we read in Acts ii. 38, "Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you *in the name of Jesus Christ*." See also Chap. viii. 16; x. 48; xix. 5. And in Galatians iii. 27, we find, "As many of you as have been *baptized into Christ*, have put on Christ." This omission of the Apostles is one which can hardly be accounted for on the assumption that the words in Matthew had a reference to the belief in, and worship of, three co-equal and co-eternal persons subsisting in one and the same essence.

In reference to this text we cannot resist submitting to our readers a remarkable passage in the *Confessions of a Member of the Church of England*:—

"This," says he, "is certainly the strongest, I believe I may say, the only genuine text that can be fairly advanced in defence of the doctrine of a Trinity of Persons. If our Lord had added the words 'Three Persons and one God' as does our Church, I should bow with submission, though in opposition to so many other texts. Had our Lord intended to restore a true but forgotten doctrine, it cannot reasonably be doubted that he would have added these words; and that he would have declared the doc-

trine in the plainest terms, in the course of his instructions to his disciples. Nothing of the kind is to be met with in any of his discourses; on the contrary, very many of his expressions are irreconcilable with such an idea.

"The form of the commission thus given to the Apostles, regarding baptism, is certainly very remarkable, and calls for deep investigation and reflection. Long, very long, did it dwell with me, though I continually met with passages in the Bible which seemed to be directly opposed to the use that is made of it.

"What can a poor frail mortal, conscious of his lack of wisdom, do, but carefully to examine the word of God; to compare one part with another, to meditate deeply upon it, with an earnest desire to arrive at the truth, and to implore the Father of Lights to guide him by his Holy Spirit in the inquiry? This method I have for many years endeavoured most anxiously and devoutly to pursue; the result has been a clear conviction, that the words delivered in this remarkable text were not intended to be an initiation into the doctrine of a Trinity of Persons in the Godhead."

The next passage deserving comment, which is frequently adduced to prove that the one God consists of three persons, possessing alike the divine perfections, and who are equally entitled to religious worship, occurs in 2 Cor. xiii. 14., "The grace of the Lord *Jesus Christ*, and the love of *God*, and the communion of the *Holy Ghost* be with you all." Here we find in the same sentence, the association of the name of Christ and of the Holy Spirit with that of the Supreme Being; Christ's named placed before that of God; and, moreover, the verse itself is alleged by Trinitarians to contain a prayer addressed to Jesus Christ, to God, and to the Holy Ghost. Now, in the first place, we would ask, is it probable that the Apostle (whose words bear clear testimony, in point of fact, to the strict unity of the Almighty, the term *God* being restricted to *one* person) would have applied the common name of the Divine Being to the Father only, had he been a believer in the Deity of two other persons, called "God the Son" and "God the Holy Ghost?"

In reply to the reasons above cited as generally assigned for the proof of the Trinity in this text, Mr. Wilson has

well observed, that "the conjunction of the name of one individual with that of another, does not imply equality of power, or identity of essence; since we find, in the records of Divine revelation, several instances of the names of men and angels, and even of things, associated with that of the Creator, in the expression of the same or of similar acts." These instances are indeed too numerous to quote. He goes on, "If precedence in the order of naming prove anything, in respect to Christ and God, it will prove too much; namely, that the Son of God is *superior* to his Father; the argument, therefore, in support of their equality, is manifestly wrong. The Jews charged St. Stepnen with having blasphemed *Moses and God* (Acts vii. 11); but who, from this collocation of words, would infer, that either the martyr or his enemies had put the Hebrew legislator on a footing of perfect equality with Jehovah? A similar question might be asked concerning Abram, whom Melchizedek blessed prior to the Most High (Gen. xiv. 19, 20); and concerning Paul and others, who are in the same sentence mentioned before God and the Lord Jesus (1. Thess. i. 6, &c.) Thirdly, the benediction contained in the passage does not warrant the practice of praying to Christ and the Holy Ghost. If it did, then should we be obliged to admit, that the seven spirits, whose blessing is conjoined by the Apostle John with that of the Eternal One and Jesus Christ (Rev. 1—4, 5), were each of them the Supreme Deity, and entitled to religious adoration. It is worthy of remark, that the Holy Spirit is never mentioned by St. Paul in any other of his forms of benediction (of which twenty instances at least might be cited); a circumstance which it would be very difficult to account for, on the supposition that this was a Divine person, distinct from God the Father, and entitled equally with Him to Divine honours."

Having thus given a brief examination of the two principal passages alleged as evidencing the doctrine of a Triune God, we proceed to one or two others adduced by Trinitarians in confirmation of the opinion that Christ is equal to, or identified with God. The first that presents itself to our attention, as being often quoted to prove that Christ is of the *same substance* as the Father, is John x. 30: "I and my Father are *one*." We may

just observe, by the way, that the peculiar phraseology here adduced for the Deity of Christ, is not uncommon in the Scriptures, and would be equally valid in proving that two or more human beings are only one man. Thus, Paul and Apollos are regarded as one; "I have planted, Apollos watered. * * * Now, he that planteth and he that watereth are *one*." (1. Cor. iii. 6, 9,) &c., &c. But, let us appeal to a more venerable authority than our own, or, it will be allowed, than that of any contemporary. "Two things," says Milton, "may be called one in more than one way. Scripture saith, and the Son saith, '*I and my Father are one;*' I bow to their authority. Certain commentators conjecture that they are one in *essence;* I reject what is merely man's invention. For the Son has not left us to conjecture in what manner he is one with the Father (whatever member of the church may have first arrogated to himself the merit of the discovery); but explains the doctrine himself most fully, so far as we are concerned to know it. The Father and the Son are one, not indeed in essence, for he had himself said the contrary in the preceding verse, *my Father which gave them me, is greater than all* (see also xiv. 28, *my Father is greater than I*), and in the following verses he distinctly denies that he hath made himself God in saying, *I and my Father are one;* he insists that he had only said as follows, which implies far less (x. 36), *say ye of Him whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?* This must be spoken of two persons not only not co-essential, but not co-equal. Now, if the Son be laying down a doctrine respecting the unity of the Divine essence in two persons of the Trinity, how is it that he does not rather attribute the same unity of essence to the three persons? Why does he divide the indivisible Trinity? For there cannot be unity without totality. Therefore, on the authority of the opinions holden by my opponents themselves, the Son and the Father without the Spirit are not one in essence. How then are they one? It is the province of Christ alone to acquaint us with this, and accordingly he does acquaint us with it. In the first place, they are one, inasmuch as they speak and act with unanimity; and so he explains himself in the same chapter, after the Jews had mis-

understood his saying: (x. 38), *believe the works; that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in Him* (xiv. 10); *believest Thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself, but the Father that dwelleth in me, He doeth the works.* Here he evidently distinguishes the Father from himself in his whole capacity; but asserts, at the same time, that the Father remains in him; which does not denote unity of essence, but only intimacy of communion. Secondly, he declares himself to be one with the Father, in the same manner as we are one with him—that is, not in essence, but in love, in communion, in agreement, in charity, in spirit, in glory."*

In the Epistle of St. Paul to the Philippians, we read, (Chap. ii. 6) "Who (*i. e.* Christ Jesus) being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God." The Greek word rendered "form" in this passage, implies the *outward form, face, resemblance* of anything or person, in opposition to its real internal nature and constitution. "The whole passage seems to me," says Erasmus, "to be very violently misapplied to the *nature* of Christ; since Paul is treating only of his APPEARANCE *as exhibited* to us." The same word (μορφη) occurs repeatedly in the Jewish Scriptures, particularly the septuagint version, but only once in the New Testament exclusively of the text we are now considering. The phrase, *form of God*, no more implies that Christ was that God in whose form he appeared, than the expression, *form of a servant*, occurring in the following verse, implies that he actually entered into the condition

* This passage is taken from the posthumous work of Milton, entitled, "A Treatise on Christian Doctrine, compiled from the Holy Scriptures alone," and translated from the Latin by Dr. Sumner, Bishop of Winchester. Portions of the Chapters on the Son of God and the Holy Spirit have been republished, under the title of "John Milton's Last Thoughts on the Trinity," the editor of which observes, that the general preface to the work breathes a fine spirit of religious liberty, and concludes with the just remark, that "Milton is henceforth to be ranked amongst those Christian scholars, a numerous and honourable class, who have rejected the doctrine of the Trinity as an unscriptural innovation, and a corruption of the pure doctrine of Christ. It may surely suffice to shield Unitarian Christians from some of the reproaches which are so frequently cast upon them, that to them belongs a triumvirate of intellect, wisdom, learning, and piety, which cannot be paralleled, in the immortal names of Locke, Newton, and Milton."

of a *bond-servant.* "The meaning probably is," says Mr. Wilson, in his admirable work on "Scripture Proofs and Scriptural Illustrations of Unitarianism," "that he possessed great benevolence, wisdom, and authority; that he acted in the capacity of God himself (see John x. 34—36); that, to demonstrate the Divinity of his mission, he was gifted by the Father with a voluntary power of controlling the laws of nature—of curing the most inveterate diseases, bestowing food in a miraculous manner to famishing multitudes, giving sight to the blind, and restoring the dead to life. This explanation, we think, harmonises both with the scope of the Apostles' reasoning, and with the whole tenour of our Lord's deportment and actions. Though, 'in the form of God'—though in the possession of extraordinary and Divine powers, he did not assume the splendour of such a state, 'but made himself of no reputation'—he lived in poverty and contempt, while he meliorated the condition of thousands around him, by the employment of his mighty powers. "He took upon him the form of a servant;" he not only exercised, for the good of others, the Godlike qualifications with which he had been invested by the Father, but he ministered to the welfare of his brethren, by the practice of duties peculiar to the meanest slave."

With regard to the real import of the latter part of the verse in question, "*thought it not robbery to be equal with God,*" there seems considerable difficulty, and hence an abundance of conjectural interpretation. The difficulty seems to lie in the ambiguity of the Greek words, rendered by "ROBBERY," and "*to be equal.*" Commentators will, of course, be naturally inclined to give that signification to the passage which seems to comport best with their pre-conceived notions. Unfortunately the word here translated "ROBBERY," scarcely occurs in any other Greek writer; nor is it agreed among the learned, exactly in what sense it should be taken—whether it should be construed actively or passively, that is, whether it signifies an act of seizure, or the prey, the booty, the thing seized upon; though the majority of expositors lean to the latter view. Again, the word translated "*equal*" is derived from one which signifies *to be like, to resemble*; hence, the rendering may very justly be given, "*to be like, or, to resemble God,*" as well as, "*to be equal with God.*"

And some of the most learned Trinitarians, as well as the generality of Unitarians, have conceived the Greek expression thus translated to denote, not perfect equality, but mere resemblance. Dr. S. Clarke thus explains the passage:—"Did not covet to be honoured as God, was not greedy, or fond of, did not look upon it as a prize to be hastily catched at." Emlyn and Cappe say: "thought it no robbery, or prey, to be like to God;" and Mr. Mardon, "did not eagerly grasp at this resemblance to God."

From the conflict of opinions as to the true interpretation of this confessedly difficult passage, we may appeal to the whole tenour of the Apostle's language in this Epistle, and enquire what was his design? Was it to represent Christ as claiming equality with God? Why, in the most earnest manner he recommends to the Philippians, meekness of disposition and humility of deportment. He entreats them to discard all sentiments of selfishness and vain glory—to be influenced only by motives of the most disinterested nature. He places before their eyes the example of their Lord and Master, who, so far from arrogating to himself equality with God, preferred being subject to the greatest ills of which human nature is susceptible, rather than appear with that splendour of dignity which he might justly have assumed, rather than employ, for his own ease and emolument, those extraordinary powers, which he had received from the Father. This interpretation, borne out by many translations, seems quite in unison with the Apostle's design; for it is highly improbable, that he should have recommended to the members of the Phillippian church to "esteem others better than themselves," and, at the same time, exhibit, as an incentive to such praiseworthy conduct, the example of one who, instead of being "meek and lowly in heart"—instead of relinquishing his own comforts in order to minister to the wants of others, esteemed himself infinitely above his brethren, by putting himself on a perfect equality with the greatest and the best of beings. St. Paul could not have truly asserted that Christ did not think it a robbery, or an unjust assumption, to be equal with God; for our Lord never assumed such equality—he never claimed independent power. On the contrary, he testified, both by his words

and actions, that all the authority he possessed was the gift of a Superior Being.

The reader is now left to his choice, whether he shall adopt a rendering which is at least of doubtful authority—which is opposed, in its tendency, to the principal design of the apostolical writer—and which is utterly repugnant to the doctrine of Christ himself; or, whether he shall prefer a translation of the passage which has been proposed by the most eminent biblical critics, which most beautifully illustrates the great virtues that the writer of the Epistle in the context, so warmly urges on the Philippian converts, and which harmonizes with every word and every act recorded of the meek and lowly Jesus!

An argument for the absolute equality of Christ with God has been founded by Trinitarians on some passages of Scripture, where, it is alleged, the Jews understood him as claiming such equality. To the most remarkable of these texts we now advert: "The Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, *making himself equal with God.*" The Greek word rendered by "equal" is the same in this as in the passage just referred to, and has the signification (as we have before remarked) of resemblance as well as equality. Hence several versions render the phrase "making himself like God." Theophilus Lindsey asserts, that "this is a just translation of the original," and that "our translators have fallen into a similar mistake in Luke xx. 36; where ισαγγελοι should be rendered, not *equal*, but *like* unto the angels." Let the mere English reader, who is unacquainted with the ancient languages, turn to the passage in Luke, and even he, we think, will be able to decide as to the justness of this criticism. It is evident the whole question hinges on the meaning of the word ισος. However, "the Jews did not mean," says Dr. S. Clarke, "to charge Jesus with affirming himself to be the Supreme, self-existent, independent Deity; but only with assuming to himself the power and authority of God." We cannot but profess ourselves of this opinion. The Jews were firm believers in the strict, undivided unity of God. They were now in the presence of one who, to all appearance, belonged to the same order of beings as themselves—a person who had never pretended to be that God, or equal to that God, whom their ances-

tors adored, though he indeed claimed authority from Him. This consideration renders it at least highly improbable that the Jews would have accused Jesus of having claimed equality with the Deity in every respect. Supposing, however that they did. Was the accusation well founded? This question may be answered by a reference to their frequent misunderstanding and perversion of our Lord's language (as in John ii. 19, 21; vi. 52, &c.), and their bitter reprehension of him for words and conduct of the most unexceptionable kind. (See John x. 19, 20; vii. 20; viii. 48. See also John ix. 16; Luke vi. 1, 11, &c., &c.) But, can an argument for the doctrine of his essential equality with the Father be justly deduced from his own words or deportment on this occasion? Did *he* claim this equality? He had indeed called God his Father; and this he might do with the utmost propriety, seeing that he was the most gifted and favoured of God's children, His beloved Son, the Messiah. Hence we conclude that the only *kind* of equality to which Jesus laid claim was a *likeness* or resemblance to God. And what was his justification? He had cured an impotent on the Sabbath; and for this benevolent act he was persecuted by his countrymen, and charged with having violated the sanctity of that holy day. The argument which he employed in his defence is fraught with the highest moral beauty and sublimity. "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work;" that is, "My Father never ceaseth to perform deeds of benevolence and mercy: I imitate that kind and gracious Being; for I also delight to perform works of mercy towards the lame, the blind, the poor, whether on the Sabbath, or on any other day which presents opportunities for the exercise of the powers with which I am entrusted." This answer, so far from satisfying our Lord's persecutors, served to irritate them the more, and they charged him with assuming too much authority; he denied the charge in that remarkable verse immediately following our text: "Then answered Jesus, and said unto them, verily, verily, I say unto you, *the Son can do nothing of himself*, but what he seeth the Father do; for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise." And in verse 30: "*I can of mine ownself do nothing.* As I hear, I judge; and my judgment is just; because I seek *not*

mine own will, but the will of the Father who hath sent me."

We shall notice one more passage adduced as a testimony to the Divine nature of Christ, and conclude.—It is from the Old Testament: Isaiah ix. 6; "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; * * and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the *mighty God,* the *everlasting Father,* the Prince of Peace." In the first place, it is worthy of notice that Jesus and his Apostles, fond as they were of using Scriptural language, never quoted this passage, nor is it cited in any part of the New Testament. Surely, had it been viewed by them in the same light as it is by the generality of Christians at the present day, it would have been repeatedly referred to in confirmation of a doctrine which must have been altogether strange and novel in the eyes of the Jews In the second, the passage itself is admitted by Bishop Lowth to be very obscure, and attended with "many and great difficulties." It has been variously rendered by writers of great learning and piety, and cannot, therefore, consistently be appealed to in proof of the doctrine generally supposed to be confirmed by it. The word *God,* in the Bible, has various significations:—It sometimes denotes merely the qualities of *strength, greatness, excellence,* &c., in the subjects to which it is applied; and is often used in reference to angels, judges, and holy men: thus, it is applied to Moses in Exod. vii. 1.; "And the Lord said unto Moses, see, I have made thee *a god* to Pharoah; and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet." It was not unusual among the Jews, as Jesus himself admits (John x. 34—36.) to bestow this appellation on any person "to whom the word of God came." Had Jesus, therefore, assumed the title of a *God,* he would have been fully justified by the practice of his countrymen; on the contrary, however, he seemed studiously to shun every expression that might be deemed to imply the arrogation of that honour which is due to the only true God.

The titles, *Wonderful, Counsellor,* cannot be advanced as proof of the Divinity of the person to whom they are applied, as they are often used in relation to men and things. With regard to the title, *Everlasting Father,* biblical writers of all denominations generally prefer the

rendering, *Father of the everlasting*, or *future age;* an appellation not inapplicable to Christ, inasmuch as he may be considered as appointed by God to be the instructor of future generations, the head and introducer of a new and everlasting dispensation. And if any of God's messengers pre-eminently deserve the distinction of *Prince of Peace*, it is undoubtedly the Messiah, the great end of whose mission was, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will toward men."

We have now gone through the task we had proposed to ourselves. In the preceding number of the UNITARIAN, we endeavoured to show the superior reasonableness and efficacy of Unitarianism over Trinitarianism in a moral and intellectual point of view: in the present, it has been our object to confirm and fortify the justness of those speculations by showing that there is no sufficiently tenable ground for deducing the doctrine of a Trinity in the Godhead—or, at least (which is about the same thing), the Supreme Deity of Christ—from the passages of Scripture, generally and popularly alleged to substantiate it. We have selected those texts ourselves, it is true, but we shall surely not be charged with unfairness in this respect, as no Trinitarian can deny that they are of the number most favourable to His views; in fact, the very passages that an ordinary student of the Scriptures is most anxious to know how the Unitarians "get over," as he terms it. We lay but little claim to originality of view or of statement: our principal aim having been to make known the arguments heretofore advanced, and the conclusions already drawn by some of the most profound reasoners, and the most learned biblical critics. The result is left to the judgment of the pious and candid reader.

THE BENEVOLENCE OF DEITY ILLUSTRATED.

No subject can be more worthy of our contemplation than the benevolence of the Creator. To this sublime attribute we are indebted for our existence, and everything that can make life desirable. At His command, prolific earth yields abundant increase to the labour of man, and His wisdom and goodness hath decreed that the means by which all life is sustained, should be the inlets of pleasure. For the desires that elicit our energies and for the wants that stimulate us to action, His bounty has

amply provided; He openeth his hand, and His creatures are filled with good. Nor ends his kindness here: with this abundance of blessings to His wisdom it seemed good to amalgamate a portion of evil, that man might acquire knowledge by experience and comparison of opposites, and his happiness be promoted and enhanced by the contrast. Still mindful of the creature He had endued with superior intellect—"for empire formed, and fit to rule the rest"—He leaves him not uninstructed to pursue life's devious course, but prescribes him laws, and bids him avoid the evil, though it should assume the seducing appearance of pleasure, for vexation and disappointment are its constant attendants; but virtue, under every circumstance, undeviating, still pursue! Though difficult, perhaps, the way appear, the prospect will brighten as you advance, and immortal honour shall crown your perseverance. Heed, then, the high behest! for your reward shall be proportioned to your obedience.

POETRY.

CHARITY.

Go ye to the abodes of sadness,
  To the abode of want and grief:
There diffusing joy and gladness,
  There bestowing wished relief.
Wait not for the coming morrow,
  Ere its sun may shine on thee,
Death may check the voice of sorrow,
  End thy work of charity.

Go ye to the dying pillow,
  With thy sympathy and care;
Where death's Jordan rolls its billow,
  Hear the orphan's lisping prayer;
And to yonder friendless dwelling,
  Let thy willing footsteps bend.

Let no cold inquiries hinder,
  Where your duty bids you go;
While with faltering steps you linger,
  Their's are deepest stings of woe.
Such is not an angel's mission,
  Such is not the work of love;

When you hear the sad petition,
  Onward, quickly—freely move.

Go not for the sake of "fashion,"
  Or the trumpet's flattering sound,
Which shall publish through the nation
  How thy charities abound!
Better have thy name recorded
  In a higher, brighter sphere,
Than to have it thus applauded,
  By thy fellow mortals here.

Let the miser count his treasure—
  Let the selfish study ease—
The luxurious his pleasure—
  And the envious pine and tease;
Mine shall be the high enjoyment
  To administer relief,
Like an angel's blest employment,
  Healing bosoms torn with grief.

NEW BOOKS.

At a time when the subject of peace has been so much discussed, the following remarks on the words of Christ, which have so often been misunderstood by commentators, and which are sometimes still adduced by the ignorant to palliate war, may not be unacceptable to our readers. They are extracted from that truly valuable work, which ought to be in the hands of every biblical student—"Notes and Comments on Passages of Scripture," by John Kentish.

Matthew x. 34, "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword." This is no "ambiguous text."* The two clauses of it should be compared with each other: in the former the declaration is negative and general—"Think not that I am come to send peace on earth," and this is explained by the remaining sentence, "I came not to send peace but a sword." War, undoubtedly, is one of those states of things which are exactly the reverse of peace. Still, it is not the only one. Peace is public or private, national or domestic; and the opposite of private tranquillity is *division*. In

* Hist. of Decline, &c., 8vo., V. ix. 295, (ch. 1.)

Scriptural phraseology, too, a sword is spoken of as an emblem and instrument, sometimes of division,* sometimes of civil justice;† and that is said to be intended, which, in fact, is nothing more than the unavoidable consequence of a particular event or measure. If these remarks fail to satisfy us, we shall nevertheless admit that the best expositor of the words of Christ is Christ himself. Look, then, at Luke xii. 51, and all doubt will be removed, "Suppose ye that I am come to g ve peace on earth? I tell you nay, but rather *division.*" He returns here to a subject, which he had touched upon before, in this very chapter (Matt. x. 21), and he now enlarges on the fact, and points out its proper application. Not only so; as if to obviate the possibility and suspicion of *ambiguous* language, he explains himself by saying, "for I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, a d the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law, and a man's foes‡ shall be those of his own household." Thus he predicted that the unbelieving members of a family would be the bitterest enemies of those under the same roof, who worshipped the one living God in the name of His Son Jesus. Mr. Bryant approached to a just interpretation of this verse, which he explains,§ of the impending Jewish war, and the ruin of Jerusalem—of the evils that would necessarily be brought upon his countrymen, for their rejection of the Messiah. That the words do not relate to the *earth* in general, or to any distant time, but to the *land*,‖ and to the age in which Jesus lived, I infer from the context. K.

Authentic Report of the Public Discussion between Joseph Barker and William Cooke at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, on August 19th, 20th, 21st, 22nd, 26th, 27th, 28th, and September 2nd, 3rd, and 4th, on the Question "What is a Christian?" &c. &c. London: Sold by Mr. Mardon; 1845 (pp. 620).

Different men have different missions in this world of ours, varying according to the aptitudes of their minds, and the opportunities afforded by their post in life. Every man has some capabilities, and, of consequence, correspondent obligations. None liveth to himself; and to all is addressed the injunction, "Occupy till I come." All are to strive to be useful in their generation—all should endeavour to give a reason in their life for being here—all should seek to make the world the wiser, the better, or the happier by having lived in it. But this may be

---

* 2 Sam. xii. 10; 1 Kings iii. 24; Luke ii. 35.
† Job xix. 29; Acts xii. 2; Rom. viii. 35, xiii. 4.
‡ Micah vii.6.
§ Treatise upon the Authenticity of the Scriptures, &c., ed. 2 pp, 218, &c.
‖ Luke xviii. 8.

done in various ways. There is a diversity of gifts, but one Spirit. One may devote himself, with a feeling of religious responsibility that shall hallow his pursuit, to art and science; another, to general knowledge and literature. This man may have it in charge to advance the cause of Education; that to promote moral and philanthropic Reforms. To some it may belong to pass their time in secluded study, working out, in their meditations thoughts that shall stir men's souls, and move them to battle bravely with the wrong and uphold the right; whilst others may be called to go forth into the world, and speak in a thrilling tone to the masses, of their rights, their duties, and their responsibilities. It is the mission of one—and a lofty mission it is—to labour in the retirement of home to call forth in her children's minds the love of all that is true, and pure, and of good report; it is that of another to go abroad and urge the claims of a purer Theology, a more practical Religion, a more earnest Piety.

This latter appears to us to be eminently the mission of Joseph Barker, and right well and faithfully is he fulfilling it. He is a true Religious Reformer. He not only pulls down, but he builds up. His influences are creative as well as destructive. He demolishes Error, the more effectually to establish Truth, and, like the Apostles of old, if he calls men from their "vanities," it is only that he may lead them to the "living God." This is the genuine spirit of Reform, a spirit which needs but to be more widely diffused to purify the church and bless the world.

And surely a nobler work than this of Religious Reform cannot be engaged in. All truth is important; but Religious Truth is of supreme value. Whoever believes that Jesus came into the world to bear witness to the truth, must also believe that that which was introduced by means of so many miracles, and at the expense of so much suffering, is of infinite moment. All honour then to those—the real benefactors of society—who seek to rescue the teachings of Jesus from the admixtures of human error with which they have been blended, and to disseminate the pure Gospel, that by the Truth men may be made free and sanctified.

Of the various successful labours of Joseph Barker in this field we need not here enter into detail: they must be too well known to most of our readers to require this. We will simply state that a few years since he was a very popular and influential minister amongst the New Connexion Methodists; but having a mind too bold and free to submit to the trammels of conference, he was, in 1841, expelled from that body. This proceeding, contrary to the design of its promoters, neither checked his zeal nor impaired his influence, but added materially to both. Many thousands left the New Connexion after him, and formed themselves into independent churches, adopting generally his principles as this bond of union and ground of action.

At the time that he left the Methodists Mr. Barker had given up the doctrines of the Trinity, and Vicarious Satisfaction, and he has since relinquished other kindred doctrines of Orthodoxy. The extraordinary vigour and success with which he has disseminated

his altered opinions, from the pulpit and through the press, in the lecture-room and at open-air meetings, has, as might have been expected, called forth against him opponents not a few from amongst his old associates. Of these Mr. William Cooke, an active New Connexion Minister, has not been the least zealous. He published several tracts on the subject, and the Discussion, the Report of which has occasioned this notice, was the result.

We are not much inclined to view with favour *vivâ voce* controversies on subjects so grave and important, and involving so many serious points, which ought not to be decided upon without much thought and careful deliberation, as the various controverted doctrines of Christianity. In such discussions, party spirit, we are apt to think, generally predominates over calm judgment, amongst the auditors; whilst the principals are strongly tempted, each to seek a personal triumph over his opponent, rather than the establishment of Truth. We are glad, however, that the present Discussion has taken place, not that these dangers have been entirely escaped, for there are abundant evidences in the Report, of great warmth of party feeling among a portion, at least, of the audience; and the greatest stretch of charity cannot acquit Mr. Cooke of a most unbecoming desire to excite prejudice against his opponent personally, rather than fairly to meet his arguments. His frequent allusions to Mr. Barker's former opinions; his habit of classing him with Lloyd Jones, an unbeliever whom Mr. Barker had on a former occasion successfully met in controversy; his appeals to the passions of his audience; the extraordinary way in which he availed himself of the "Terms," to prevent his opponent completing his observations on the miraculous conception; and then the bombastic childishness with which, after resorting to this despicable artifice to stop his opponent's mouth, he "waved the banner of triumph" and, "*in the name of the Christian Public claimed the victory!*" are sad exemplifications of the dangers incident to platform controversies.

Yet, we repeat, we rejoice that this Discussion has taken place. We believe it will greatly subserve the cause of Truth; and to any one in doubt as to the various topics it embraced—to any one whose mind may vibrate between the arguments of the upholders of the Trinity and its cognate doctrines, and those of their rejectors—the Report of this Discussion will be most valuable. We trust it will have a large circulation. Agreeing as we do substantially with the views of Mr. Barker, on the Trinity, the Supremacy of the Father, Human Depravity, the objects of Christ's mission and death, &c. &c., we are most desirous that his admirable defence of these views, should go forth side by side with the speeches of Mr Cooke, in support of the contrary opinions. We are quite willing that the careful reader should look on this picture and on that, and decide accordingly.

We speak thus after a careful perusal of the Report. The more we read the more were we interested by the unaffected style, the profound thought, and the calm, clear reasoning of Mr. Barker; and the more did we admire the readiness and power,

with which, notwithstanding the unfair disadvantage of having to speak last every evening, he at once met his opponent's arguments, and exposed his sophisms. Not a point escapes him; but, throwing aside all the personal matter in which his opponent so much indulged, he in every address comes at once to the principles in dispute—takes up his opponent's reasonings one by one, omitting none, however trivial—fairly meets and answers them, and then proceeds to enunciate and defend affirmatively his own views. More than once have we felt, in reading this Report, that if every man were a Joseph Barker, in candour and aptness for debate, we should certainly get over the doubts we have expressed as to the expediency of these discussions.

We will not attempt an analysis of the controversy. Besides our want of space for such a work, we trust it is altogether unnecessary; as the price of the Report being so low, we should hope it will be in the hands of all our readers. But we would especially point attention to Mr. Barker's clear and satisfactory explanations of the various passages relative to our Lord's death, which are so often misunderstood and misapplied. He shows them to have a beautiful significance, alike in accordance with God's glory and man's eternal interests, teaching and illustrating the glorious truth, that Jesus came into the world to deliver men from sin, and reconcile them to each other and to God—to break down the partition wall between Jews and Gentiles—and to assemble all, as obedient sons, and a united brotherhood, around the altar of one common Father, and one common God.

True to his mission, too, Mr. Barker takes every opportunity of setting forth the great practical principles of the Gospel, and some of the most interesting parts of his speeches are those passages in which he dwells, with a sweet and winning simplicity, on the important duties which form the sum and substance of true religion. His application of Scripture phraseology is here most apt and striking. In the course of his speech on the seventh night of Debate, he says:—

I come, now, to ask what is the sum of practical religion? For I should not feel easy, if, after seven nights' debate, it should be found that we had not called attention to our own practice, our own business, and our own great interests.—What, then, is the sum of true religion? I answer, it is to love God with all our hearts, and always to try to please him; it is to love our neighbours as ourselves, and to labour to do them good—to do good unto *all* as we have *opportunity*. This is the simple religion of Christ. This was the religion which Jesus Christ himself *practised*. And it was by the practice of this religion that he obtained his Father's special approbation. It was by fidelity in the practice of this religion, as the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews declares, that he obtained such distinguished honours; it was because he *loved righteousness*, or *beneficence*, and *hated iniquity*, that God chose him to be the Messiah, anointed him, took him out from among his fellows, and made him the honoured instrument of instructing, regenerating, and saving the world. That was Christ's religion. He loved his Father, and always did the thing that pleased him. It was his meat and drink to do his Father's will. He loved mankind, and he went about doing them good. He did not go up and down preaching against

and denouncing those who happened not to hold correct opinions—bringing down fire from heaven on those who could not exactly see so far as himself, and sending poor Samaritans to hell because they took only the five books of Moses, while the Jews took the prophets as well. No; he went about teaching people the true Gospel, not orthodoxy. He exhibited the charity of the Gospel in his own example. Doing good was the business of his life. He did good to all, always varying his benefits as their several circumstances required. To some he gave food, to some health, to some instruction; and he regarded all with goodwill, he treated all with kindness. He was especially wishful to impart instruction; and he laboured most zealously and constantly to save men's souls. And he had no respect of persons. The Samaritan was as dear to him as the Jew, if he possessed a kind heart and a pious disposition. And he more than once took occasion to set forth Samaritans, who had distinguished themselves in a striking manner for their piety or charity, as examples to the Jews. He repeatedly held forth *Samaritans* as giving them an example which they ought to imitate. He went about doing good, not only to people's bodies, but to people's minds. And his efforts were unwearied. He exercised the utmost patience and forbearance towards his disciples; and he never delighted in denouncing judgments. When he *did* choose to thunder, his thunders were directed, not against the poor, common people, that could not give up their minds to be governed by men's traditions, but against the Rabbis, who occupied the chief seats in the chapels, and doomed men to damnation, because they would not adopt their traditions. Such was the religion of Christ. And if we are religious after Christ's fashion, we may depend upon it we shall be religious indeed, and religious to good purpose.

Again, in the same speech, after having quoted largely from the Gospels, to show the practical character of their requirements, he says:—

This has *always* been true religion. To love our fellow-men, to do men good,—to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with our God, was the religion enjoined on the patriarchs, and on the ancient Jews. To inculcate this religion has been the object of all God's dispensations from the beginning of the world to the present time.

Debates are of no use, but as they tend to promote this kind of religion.

This debate will be so far useful, as it tends to let folks see that there is no end to men's wranglings about orthodox mysteries, and the inventions of men; that the whole of true religion and man's welfare are summed up in love to God and in love to mankind; that to believe in Jesus as the Messiah, as God's Son, and to place ourselves in hearty submission to Christ's instruction and authority, that we may learn and do God's will, is everything. And unless this debate answer these purposes, it is time and labour lost. I have done my best to make it answer them. I trust you will all ponder what you now hear—that you will compare it with the Scriptures—and then judge whether the whole end of the Bible is not, as we have said, to make people good in their hearts, and good, and holy, and God-like in their lives, and I shall be satisfied. Let men attend to this, and make it their whole object to *be* good and *do* good, and they will be saved indeed. Let us attend to this, and we shall continually grow wiser, and better, more free, and more God-like; and we shall grow more useful, and more happy too. This simple religion is man's all; it is man's glory,—it is man's perfection,—it is man's safety,—it is man's happiness, it is man's heaven.

We might fill our number with passages such as these, but we must forbear. We cannot, however, omit the expression of our disapproval of some passages in the Appendix, and our regret that they should have found a place there. The general and unqualified denunciations of "Orthodox" ministers, and the harsh language respecting "Orthodoxy," into which Mr. Barker has allowed himself to fall, can only impair the force of his arguments, while they but ill accord with that principle of love, which he upholds as the essence of religion, and which we are persuaded is, in the main, the ruling principle that animates him in his beneficent and praiseworthy labours. We know that in his case, there has been an almost incredible amount of provocation; but charity beareth all things, and no one has more forcibly than himself inculcated the Christian duty of overcoming evil with good. These defects are, however, but spots in the sun; and, in conclusion, we again cordially and earnestly recommend this Report—which is published from the short-hand writer's notes and authenticated by him—to the careful perusal of our readers. It forms quite an arsenal of weapons in defence of the pure Gospel, and the more widely it is distributed, the better, we are persuaded, will it be for the interests of Christian truth.

SELECTIONS.

Memory.—It is frequently a matter of regret that memory is so defective that we can call to mind so small a portion of what we read or hear, when desirous of instruction. But what would be the consequence if we could retain all we read and all we hear on such occasions? The great variety of subjects, and the diversity of opinions on the same subject, and different styles of composition, would make the mind a confused medley—a mere Chaos. We commonly retain some general impressions that may serve for mental exercise, and if by reflection we could concentrate these and array them in our own language so as to examine their validity, adopting such sentiments as would bear our scrutiny, reserving the doubtful for further investigation and rejecting the fallacious, however popular or plausible, we should not be very great sufferers by the absence of that power of retention which is so much deplored.

There is a great deal said about the beauty of *maternal* love; paternal love presents, perhaps, a picture of greater beauty, and one far more touching; and it is my opinion, that he who has shared the happiness of experiencing the fostering care of an affectionate and no less conscientious father, can lift up his heart with more fervent feelings, with more heartfelt comprehension than every other, in that universal prayer of mankind, "Our Father!"—*F. Bremer.*

Peace requires a measure of power equally as great as war, but against another kind of foe. Every refinement of earthly existence—every thing which raises the senses to a more intellectual life—is a battery set up against the lower pursuits in man, and a service done to humanity, and our fatherland.—*Idem.*

MRS. DANA'S LETTERS.

["Letters Addressed to Relatives and Friends, chiefly in Reply to Arguments in Support of the Doctrine of the Trinity. By Mary S. B. Dana. Boston, 1845."]

LETTER I.

January 19th, 1845.

My Kind and Venerated Parents:

It has become my solemn duty to make to you an announcement, which, I fear, will fill your hearts with sorrow. Would to God, that I could save you from the pain, which, from my knowledge of your views and feelings, I am sure awaits you; but I believe, as God is my Judge, that *truth* is dearer to me than life itself, and I dare no longer disavow the sentiments, which, after thorough, and *honest*, and prayerful deliberation, I have at length adopted.

I will keep you no longer in suspense, but will proceed to declare, that I do not now believe that my blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ is the Supreme God. I believe that there is but *one* God, the Father, of whom are all things, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things. I believe that "all power," was *given* unto Him in heaven and on earth; * that he was the Messiah predicted by the Old Testament writers, who, in the fulness of time, came into the world with a commission from God, and full power and authority to do the work which God had given him to do. In other words, after long and earnest deliberation, much diligent study of the Holy Scriptures, and fervent prayer to God for the assistance of his spirit, I conscientiously and firmly reject the doctrine of the Trinity.

This doctrine was a part of my education. I received it, as many others do, without thorough investigation, though, I must confess, it has often perplexed me beyond measure. Still I held it, as it seems to me all must do, as a strange mystery, which I must not attempt to comprehend; not considering, that a mystery does not necessarily suppose an incomprehensibility; and losing sight of the danger of admitting, what now appears to me to be an impossibility. It is impossible for me, and I now perceive that it has always been impossible to make one of three, or three of one,—one perfect and infinite being equal to three perfect and infinite beings. There may be gifted minds capable of comprehending this doctrine, but such is not mine. It is plain to me

* I would remark, that I suppose these terms to be applied to Christ *as the Messiah*, and that the expression, "all power," relates to his *Messiahship*, and to the offices he was to perform in Heaven and on earth, in connection with the redemption of mankind, which glorious objec was what his Father sent him to accomplish. It does not seem *natural* to use any of these terms in an unlimited sense. Jerome, one of the early Fathers, supposes that this term, "all power," had reference to the great power which came upon him when the spirit of God descended up on him at his baptism.

now, that I have all my life been worshipping three distinct beings; never having been able, with the most strenuous efforts, to combine the three in my own mind so as to form a simple idea. But now I bow to the divine authority, when I hear Jehovah saying, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is *one* Lord."

But to return. So anxious have I always been for clearer views upon this point, that I have eagerly read everything upon the Trinitarian side of the question which came in my way; yet always without the satisfaction so desirable to an honest and inquisitive mind, and always with the same melancholy feeling, that it was *a strange mystery;* though still I felt *bound* to receive it.

And now I will relate to you the process through which my mind has passed. For many years, I have not been able to believe, that faith in the Trinity was *necessary* to salvation, because I saw a great many exemplary Christians who did not hold the doctrine, but who nevertheless believed that Jesus was "the Christ," and "the Son of God;" and because the Apostle John has said, that whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God, and that whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God.

I have often been startled, by hearing passages of Scripture wrested from what appeared to me to be their legitimate meaning, and forced to an agreement with some favourite hypothesis. Not long ago, in a bible class which I attended, the first part of the gospel by John was examined, and then many doubts found their way into my mind, but not with so much force, or in so tangible a form, as they have recently assumed. But, had I ever been disposed to give the subject a thorough examination, I have never had access to the arguments in favour of Unitarianism, nor have I ever in my life before read upon that side of the question.

Not very long ago, while conversing with a much beloved friend (you will know to whom I allude), I found that my impressions in regard to Unitarians and to their system were exceedingly erroneous; and I expressed a wish to know a little more about their faith and practice. Was this desire wrong? Was it not in perfect accordance with that Christian charity, which "hopeth all things," and "thinketh no evil?"

And here let me exonorate from blame the two individuals from whom, entirely at my own request, I have procured the information which I wanted. In both instances, they expressed a hesitation in complying with my request, fearing to be considered obtrusive, if not by myself, at least by my friends. I cannot but believe, that this feeling arose from a confidence in the strength of their position, and a foresight of the consequences which have actually ensued.

Now what was I to do?—Shut my eyes resolutely, and *blindly* cherish the faith in which I had been educated, or sift the matter for myself? What kind of faith is that, which fears to stand the test of impartial inquiry? Would not an ingenuous mind lose all confidence in itself, and its received opinions, while there remained a consciousness of this fear and dread of investigation? Was it not my sacred duty to "prove all things," and "hold fast" only to that which I found to be "good?"

Under these circumstances I *insisted* upon having access to some writings on the subject, and such as I wished were accordingly granted me. Now I know too well the candour and nobleness of my dear parents to fear that they will impute blame where none is deserved, unless indeed they carry the doctrine of *imputation* further than I think they do. Yet, in the first overflow of feeling, they may not view the matter as temparately and fairly as they will do hereafter, and this is why I enlarge upon the point. Now suppose that a Unitarian of my age and mental capacities—one, in fact, situated just as I am—should come to you, and ask you what the Trinitarian faith really was; would you withhold from such a person the means of information? I am very sure you would not. Be generous then, and if there be any blame in the matter, let it rest upon the guilty, and not upon the innocent,—and then it certainly will fall upon no human agent, but upon a *system* which will not bear investigation.

Perhaps you will say, "Why did you not bring your doubts to us? Perhaps we could have solved them." For an opposite course I had several reasons. First, I knew perfectly well what your views were, and I had access to Trinitarian systems of Divinity, which were considered standard works; secondly, I wished to examine the subject with an unbiassed, unfettered mind; in short, to forget everything but the truth itself; and thirdly, I did not wish to give my friends unnecessary pain.

When the subject first presented itself fully and distinctly before my mind, in connection with a desire and a determination to give it a complete investigation, I felt an instinctive fear, almost a *horror*, at my presumption. I took Dr. Dwight's sermons upon the divinity of Christ, and tried to be convinced that I had all my life been in the right—I read them over and over again—I had anxious days and sleepless nights; and even in my dreams my visions were of three distinct Gods entangled together in dreadful and inextricable confusion. Thus was I driven to the examination of the subject with a power which I could not withstand.

My chief source of information has been the New Testament, and especially the Gospel by John. I endeavoured to read with an unprejudiced mind, and a teachable spirit, and to explain passages of *doubtful import* by those which would admit of *no possible mistake.* While thus reading, the doctrines of the absolute unity of God, and of the *derived* power and authority of his Son, shone forth from every page of the blessed volume, with a brightness and a clearness perfectly convincing to my wondering mind. I could no longer resist the mass of evidence which seemed fully to establish the superiority of the Father to the Son. I found that Christ always spoke of himself as inferior to his Father, of his power and authority as derived from his Father,—and it seemed to me that, if the case were otherwise (with humility let me say it), our blessed Lord had studiously endeavoured to mislead us.

I also found that the vast number of texts which directly and explicitly asserted Christ's inferiority, could only be set aside by an *assumption* of the doctrine of two natures in Christ Jesus;

and even on this assumption, such words could not have been used without apparent equivocation. On the other hand, the small number of texts which are brought forward as evidence of the deity of our Lord, *can* be explained without doing such violence to our reason, as the doctrine of two complete natures in one person—one infinite and the other finite—always must.

It seemed strange to me, that our compassionate Heavenly Father, who so well knew the weakness of human nature, should require us to receive a doctrine, *violating the common laws of that very reason which he has given us*, without such an explicit statement of it, and such an authoritative command for its reception, as would leave no possible chance for human reason to gainsay or resist it But I could find no such statement, and no such command in the Bible. Now, I had always read the Scriptures with this doctrine pervading my mind; and, *thus pre-occupied*, every passage of holy writ was made, if possible, to harmonize with my opinions.

I now found that our blessed Lord had given us a very different clue to the right understanding of the Scriptures when he declared, that *all power* was *given* to him in Heaven and on earth. With this, his own declaration, constantly in view, I found that I could understand many things which were dark before; that I had, in fact, got possession of the most prominent idea,—the current doctrine of the New Testament. This declaration of our Saviour is, to me, a most satisfactory comment on those passages brought forward in support of the Deity of the Son of God. Now, what are inferences, and what are metaphysical arguments to the unequivocal and oft-repeated declarations of Christ himself, and of his Apostles? With these for my guide, the Bible becomes plain. And when I remember that many of these passages relied upon by Trinitarians, admit of various readings,—and when I consider the well known history of the received version of the Scriptures, and that our translation was made by Trinitarians, under the auspices of that pedantic bigot, James I., I feel that the Trinitarian side of the question has had every possible advantage, and am perfectly satisfied with the views which I have adopted.

And now, when I sit down seriously to compare the system of doctrines with which I have so long been fettered, with those under the influence of which my freed spirit now joyfully springs to meet its benevolent Creator, I cannot but exclaim, "thanks be to God, who hath given me the victory, through my Lord Jesus Christ!" My *mind* is disenthralled, disenchanted, awakened as from a deathlike stupor,—all mists are cleared away,—and this feeling of light, and life, and liberty, arises from a delightful consciousness that I have learned to give the Scriptures a rational and simple interpretation, and that, on the most important of all subjects, I have learned to think for myself.

My views of my Lord and Master are dearer to me than ever before, because they are more definite. He is still my Saviour, and the Saviour of the world—the instrument chosen by his Father through whom to bestow his unmerited mercy; a willing

instrument, for he delighted to do his Father's will; an all-sufficient instrument, for *all power* was given unto him. I believe that a living faith, which will lead us to imitate him, is the only ground of our salvation; but, while I fully believe in the divinity of his character and of his mission, I do not believe that he was the supreme God himself. I believe in the efficacy of his death,—the most striking circumstance of his history,— for it was *the seal of a new and better covenant,*— an evidence of his divine commission, and of his devotion to his Father's will; without which he would not have given us such an assurance of the glorious certainty of a resurrection, by being himself the first-born from the dead; without which his work would have been incomplete, and much less calculated to affect our hearts, to bring us to repentance, to lead us to God, and to save our souls.

You cannot suppose, my beloved Parents, that I have embraced these opinions hastily or carelessly. It is painful to expose oneself to the charge of fickleness, and it is very painful to separate oneself from those who are near and dear; but God is to be my Judge; to Him alone I must answer for my opinions; to my own Master I must stand or fall; and I dare not disavow what, upon mature deliberation, I believe to be the truth. I love you, God knows how well! but I love the *truth* better; and your blessed Saviour and mine has said, "He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me." If then I embrace in my heart the doctrine which appears to me to be taught by Christ himself, must I not avow it?

With an anxious mind, an honest, tender conscience, and a prayerful spirit, I have searched the New Testament, and the result is what I have told you. My mind is open to conviction, though I do not believe that any views can be presented with which I am not already familiar. Mourn not over me, my beloved Parents, as over one lost to you for ever. If you think me in an error, rest assured it is not a fatal one. I am firmly convinced that no doctrine can be *necessary to salvation* which is not so plainly revealed, that the *conscientious* inquirer after truth cannot *possibly* mistake it. "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved," "He that believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God,"—about these plain statements there can be no mistake. Here is a glorious platform,* on which sincere Christians of every name can meet, and exchange the right hand of fellowship, exclaiming in sweet accord, "thanks be to God for his unspeakable gift!"

That our Heavenly Father may enable us all more perfectly to know him, the *only* true God, and Jesus Christ, whom he has sent; that we may increase in faith, and love, and good works; and especially that I may show in all my future life, that there is indeed the same mind in me which was also in Christ Jesus, is the earnest prayer of your affectionate daughter.

---

* "It will appear," says Dr. Gibson, Bishop of London, in his "Second Pastoral Letter," pp. 24, 25, "that the several denominations of Christians agree both in the substance of religion, and in the neces-

LINES

WRITTEN IN BIBLES GIVEN AS PRIZES TO FOUR OF THE CHILDREN OF THE UNITARIAN SUNDAY-SCHOOL, NEWPORT, ISLE-OF-WIGHT - BY ONE OF THE TEACHERS.

Ever dear to thy heart be a Prize which can guide thee
Through Virtue's bright pathway to mansions of peace.
Though earth's joys forsake thee, and sorrows betide thee,
Still it points to that home where all sorrows shall cease.

Thy Prize deserves thy choicest care,
Oft may it guide thy thought in prayer,
To seek a Father's love;
Thus shall it guard thy heart from guile,
Till thou shalt meet thy Saviour's smile,
In yon pure world above.

Yes! thou hast run the race! obtained the the Prize
Which bids thee with a sacred impulse rise,
And seek a nobler far! O bow thy will,
The Saviour's precepts freely to fulfil,
And that best Prize is thine. Still—still pursue
The path which keeps the Heavenly Goal in view.

Reason would vainly stretch her powers,
Beyond time's transient fleeting hours,
And give the anxious rest:
Then may I ever prize the light,
Which guides my weak imperfect sight,
Where hallowed truth is blest.

---

sary enforcements of the practice of it, that the world and all things were created by God, and are under the direction and government of his all-powerful hand, and all-seeing eye; that there is an essential difference between good and evil, virtue and vice; that there will be a state of future rewards and punishments according to our behaviour in this life; that Christ *was a teacher sent from God*, and that his Apostles were divinely inspired; that all Christians are bound to declare and profess themselves to be his disciples; that not only the exercise of the several virtues, but also a belief in Christ, is necessary in order to their obtaining the pardon of sin, the favour of God, and eternal life; that the worship of God is to be performed chiefly by the heart, in prayers, praises, and thanksgiving, and, as to all other points, that they are bound to live by the rule which Christ and his Apostles have left them in the Holy Scriptures. Here then is a fixed, certain, and uniform rule of faith and practice, containing all the most necessary points of religion established by a divine sanction, embraced as such by all denominations of Christians, &c."

To all which I heartily subscribe, and I therefore claim the name of Christian.

INTELLIGENCE.

EDINBURGH.

At a Tea-meeting held at St. Mark's Chapel, on the 16th of March, the Rev. J. H. Hope, of Aberdeen, in speaking of the obstacles to the progress of Unitarianism, recommended such efforts as a Unitarian League, for the diffusion of our principles, and hoped our Church might become a centre of moral warmth and intellectual light; and, while zealous to promote elevating and improving views among fellow Christians of other Churches, may our first aim be to render our own daily conduct and conversation the counterpart to that religion of love and truth, which we profess as followers of our Lord Jesus. The meeting was addressed by the Revs. J. Palmer, of Dudley; Wm. M'Kean of Oldbury; and the Rev. Thomas Bowring (Domestic Missionary), and by Messrs. J. Green, Silas Henn, of Tipton, J. Cubitt. J. Lloyd, Mathias Green, &c., by whom resolutions were moved, seconded, and spoken to.

JOSEPH BARKER AT WALSALL, OLDBURY, AND BIRMINGHAM.

The promise from the results of Mr. Barker's labours in these towns is of the most cheering kind. He arrived at Birmingham on Saturday, the 28th of February, and proceeded to Walsall next morning; where he preached morning and evening, in the Unitarian Chapel; after which, collections were made in aid of the funds of the Sunday Schools connected with the congregation. The attendance was numerous, especially in the evening. The good done here, we hope, is considerable. The simplicity, and, therefore, the power, with which Mr. Barker placed Gospel truths before his audiences, were apparent in the attention with which they listened to the glad tidings, enunciated as they were originally preached to the poor by Jesus. On Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday evenings, Mr Barker delivered three Lectures in the Unitarian Church, New Hall-hill, Birmingham. A very considerable portion of the audiences consisted of persons known to belong to the various orthodox denominations. A great interest had been excited, which was rendered the more apparent by several Quakers, on the first two evenings, attending and distributing at the doors a large number of tracts, as the audiences were dispersing; in consequence of which, on the second evening, a judicious selection of tracts, made from the stock of the *Birmingham Unitarian Sunday School Teachers' Tract Society*, were distributed, and thus an increased impulse was given, arising from the assiduity of the friends in the distribution.

On Thursday evening, 5th of March, Mr. Barker lectured in the Presbyterian Old Meeting-house, Oldbury. There was delivered an epitome of his whole previous Lectures at Birmingham, and Walsall. The effect was electrical. Many hard-worn, careful, and anxious countenances, were here congregated. The building was thronged. An attempt had been made, by misrepresentations to one of the Trustees, to obtain an interdict to the respected

minister of the place, the Rev. W. M'Kean, that the Chapel should not be used by Mr. Barker. But the attempt redounded, as such interferences ever will do where the professors of Truth are faithful to their principles, to the serving of the cause which there was the desire to crush. Oldbury had been made alive, in consequence, to what was going to take place in the evening. Many probably attended, who would not have done so, but for the intolerance of our orthodox brethren, who thus became the agents to serve the cause they would have prohibited.

On Thursday, the 13th, Mr. Barker paid another visit to Oldbury, and his appearance, as before, caused great exitement. He preached to a numerous audience. On this occasion he proved that the Scriptures were not correctly taught by the orthodox; that the doctrines held by Unitarians were in perfect unison with their teachings, and urged his proofs with such clearness and simplicity, that the most humble-minded person was enabled to understand and feel the influence of his discourse.

On Friday evening, Mr. Barker attended a Tea-party in the large room under the Church, New Hall-hill, Birmingham, expressly held in consequence of his visit to that town. More than two-hundred persons sat down to tea, which number gradually increased during the evening to about three-hundred persons.

After tea, G. S. Kenrick, Esq., was called to the chair. The interest manifested by all present was intense, and the energy with which Mr. Barker spoke of the beneficence of our Heavenly Father, and his love for all his human offspring, left deep impressions and produced in many hearts a due appreciation of His kindness, a knowledge of Him as their heavenly Parent, and a warm feeling of love to Him as their God.—*Abridged from the Inquirer.*

PLYMOUTH.

On Thursday evening, the 26th February, the Rev. W. J. Odgers, Minister of the Unitarian Chapel at Plymouth, and President of the Mechanics' Institute, delivered an admirable Lecture to this association, on the tendency of Free-trade to promote universal peace. The Hall was crowded; the audience was highly respectable, many of whom were not members of the association, and the Lecture was listened to with the greatest interest, and their pleasure and approbation were frequently testified by most enthusiastic ebullitions of applause.

W. Burnell, Esq., was in the chair, and briefly opened the business of the meeting, after which he introduced the Lecturer. We regret that our space will not allow the insertion of the Lecture; but, as a proposal to print it in a separate form was made and acceded to by the Rev. Lecturer, we hope shortly to have the opportunity of introducing it to our readers.

At the termination of the Lecture, Lieut. J. D. Harwell proposed, in glowing terms, a vote of thanks to Mr. Odgers, which was cordially seconded by Mr. Edwin James, and the vote was greeted with the heartiest applause. Mr. Odgers acknowledged the thanks so kindly voted to him. A similar proposition was made to the Chairman for the able and impartial manner in which he had performed his duties, after which the meeting broke up.

TAUNTON.

On Sunday, the 8th ult., a very elegant Tea Equipage, value £50, together with a purse of sovereigns, were presented by his congregation to the Rev. R. M. Montgomery. In the absence from illness of R. M. King, Esq., the High Sheriff of the County, and one of the oldest members of the congregation, J. U. Warren, Esq., was deputed by the Committee to read the following address immediately after the morning service :—

TO THE REV. R. M. MONTGOMERY.

REV. AND DEAR SIR—We, the members of the Mary-Street congregation, prompted by a grateful sense of the many obligations we owe to you, request your acceptance of the accompanying Tea Equipage, and purse of sovereigns, as memorials of our esteem and regard for you, as our faithful minister, judicious adviser, and warm-hearted friend.

In presenting you with these gifts, inadequate, indeed, as tributes to your worth, we are persuaded, that, in your estimation, their value will be enhanced by the circumstance of their having originated in the spontaneous suggestions and efforts of the humbler members of your congregation. They may be regarded in an especial manner as the free-will offerings of the poor, and as gratifying proofs that, in your endeavours to elevate them, socially, morally, and religiously, by appealing to their affections, and to the generous sympathies and impulses of our common nature, you have touched a chord which thrills as responsively in the hearts of the poor as of the rich—of the uneducated as of the refined—and have thus laid the surest foundation for the success of your ministrations.

We would fain express a hope that our connection with you, which has already subsisted for ten years, may long continue. May health and every blessing attend on you and on Mrs. Montgomery, who, with true devotion, has ever seconded all your efforts for usefulness. And may we, as one family, united by one faith, influenced by your teachings and example, and bound together with you by the ties of kindly feeling and reciprocal good-will, evince, in our lives and conduct towards each other, and to the world, the truth and value of the Christian principles we profess, their strength to overcome the trials and conflicts of life, and their power to inspire trust and hope in the promises and rewards vouchsafed by the gospel of Christ to those who follow Him in sincerity and truth.

Mr. MONTGOMERY briefly and feelingly returned his heartfelt thanks to the members of his congregation, who had thus testified their attachment to him, and expressed a hope that, should life and health be spared to him, he might still increase his labours, and become daily more worthy of their valuable acknowledgment of services, which he felt were little deserving of any such reward. It was, he said, peculiarly gratifying to him that the idea had originated with the poor; but he trusted and was confident, that the same feeling which had actuated them also dwelt in the hearts of those to whom more of earthly treasures had been given, and that the kindly feelings expressed towards him were generally felt by all his congregation. The reverend gentleman, whose emotion was evidently great, concluded by thanking them warmly for their kind wishes for Mrs. Montgomery, and again repeating a hope that his sphere of usefulness might become more and more enlarged among those whose kindness he should always hold in affectionate remembrance.

NEWPORT, ISLE OF WIGHT.

A large and respectable meeting of the inhabitants of Newport, Isle of Wight, was held at the Town-Hall, on Tuesday, Feb. 10th, the Rev. C. Kell in the chair, to receive a statement of the operations and claims of the Peace Society, from the Society's Agent, the Rev. W. Stokes, who, in a most eloquent and convincing appeal, showed that war is inconsistent with the spirit of Christianity, and the true interest of mankind. The following resolution was then proposed to the meeting, by R. M. WAVELL, M.D., and seconded by Mr. SAYER:—

That this meeting expresses its gratitude to the London Peace Society for their efforts in past years to promote permanent and universal peace, and more especially for their exertions at the present crisis to draw the attention of the public to this important subject.

A resolution was then proposed by Mr. T. PIERCE, and seconded by Mr. JOHNSON:—

That a petition be adopted by the meeting, praying the House of Commons to take such practical measures, that in all international treaties clauses should be introduced to refer national diputes to arbitration instead of war.

After thanks had been voted to the Mayor for the use of the Hall, and to the Chairman, the meeting separated, highly gratified with the proceedings of the evening.—*Hampshire Telegraph.*

ILMINSTER.

MUTUAL IMPROVEMENT SOCIETY.

The members and friends of this useful society were favoured with a visit from the Rev. R. M. Montgomery, Taunton, on Tuesday last, who delivered a very instructive Lecture "On the Nature and Functions of the Skin of the Human Body." The simple and lucid style in which it was given made it a source of pleasure, as well as of instruction, to the whole audience, which, we are happy to say, was one of the most numerously attended of the season.

HANDSOME DONATION.

We have pleasure in recording the liberal gift of that excellent lady, Mrs. Thos. Collins, of this town, who has given orders for the erection of a school-room adjoining the Unitarian Chapel, in East-street, at her sole expense. The building, it is expected, will be completed at Whitsuntide.

ABERDEEN.

On Tuesday, the 3rd, of March, the children in connection with the Unitarian Chapel, were examined in reading, spelling, grammar, &c &c., according to annual custom. The examination was listened to by their Parents and Friends, after which, about thirty Prizes were distributed to those most deserving them. The Rev. Mr. Hope, minister of the Chapel, conveyed to Mr. A. M'Donald the pleasure with which he and the other visitors had witnessed the evening's proceedings. The examination concluded at about 10 o'clock, when all separated, resolved not to lose sight of so worthy an object, and use every effort to extend its present usefulness.

RESIGNATION AND REMOVAL OF MINISTERS.

We understand that the Rev. R. E. B. Maclellan has signified his intention of resigning the pastoral charge of the Unitarian congregation at Bridport, on the 1st September next.

The Rev. J. H. Hope, Pastor of the congregation at Aberdeen, has resigned his pastoral charge. The Rev. P. P. Carpenter, of Stand, has accepted the invitation to become the Pastor of the congregation of the Unitarian Chapel, Warrington.

The Rev. John Wright, B.A., assistant minister of St. Saviour's Gate, Chapel, York, has accepted the unanimous invitation of the Stand congregation, to become their Pastor.

The Annual Meeting of the Southern Unitarian and Southern Unitarian Fund Societies will take place on Good Friday, April 10th, at Portsmouth. The Rev. Edward Tagart, has engaged to preach on the occasion.

MARRIAGES.

On the 21st February, at the Unitarian Church, Stockport, Mr. James Williams, to Miss Harriett Jackson.

On the 9th March, at the Unitarian Chapel, Billingshurst, by Dr. Sadler, of Hackney, Mr. Wm. Turner, to Miss Mirian Johnson.

On the 10th March, at Bowl Alley Chapel, Hull, by Rev. E. Higginson, Thos. Earle Esq., Sculptor, of Upper Ebury-street, London, to Mary, daughter, of Mr. Frank Appleyard, of Hull.

On the 22nd Feb. at Christchurch Chapel, Bridgewater, by Rev. R. L. Carpenter, B.A., Philip Shepherd, to Eliz. James.

On the 10th March, at the Great Meeting, Leicester, by the Rev. Charles Berry, Mr. Robert Marshall, to Mrs. Hipwell, both of the same town.

On the 17th March, by licence, at Chapel Lane Chapel, Bradford, by Rev. J. H. Ryland, Mr. B. G. Morris, late of Shrewsbury, to Martha, eldest daughter of Mr. J. Spencer, both of Bradford.

On the 4th March, at the parish church of Leigh, by the Rev. J. Irvine, Vicar, R. W. B. Sanderson, Esq., of Laburnam House, Chowbent, to Miss Gowland, sister-in-law to the Rev. Dr. Harrison, of Chowbent.

DEATHS.

On the 5th March, in her 42nd year, at the residence of her brother, the Rev. Dr. Hulten, Hamilton Place, King's Cross, Mrs. Brenan, widow of John E. Brenan, late of Bombay.

On the 6th March, at Horsham, aged 82, Mrs. Lucy Caffyn, much lamented by a numerous circle of friends.

On the 11th March, aged 26, Caroline, eldest daughter of Mr. Joseph Sayer, mercer, Newport, Isle of Wight.

On the 15th March, at Geldestone, Norfolk, aged 82, Susannah, relict of the late Benjamin Utting Dowson.

On the 17th March, Elizabeth Jane, eldest daughter of the late William Stanley Roscoe, of Liverpool.

Lately at Havre, Caroline, wife of Ralph Emmerson, Esq, merchant of that place, and youngest daughter of the late Rev. Israel Worsley.

On the 21st March, 1846, aged 27, James Hone, Esq., of Dublin, M.D. "An honest man's the noblest work of God." Educated by Dr. Shepherd, of Gateacre, he entered Dublin University as a Unitarian—graduated in the year. Pursuing the medical profession, he was particularly attached to the science of Natural History. A Unitarian on principle, he dreaded, notwithstanding, the tenets of the Rationalists, fearing their views might lead to unbelief, no less certainly than the preposterous weeds of orthodoxy, so called. He considered the New Testament a well-authenticated history, which it concerned the laity, not less than the clergy, to study critically. He rejoiced in the increasing knowledge of the age, and looked forward with benevolent pleasure to the growing union and brotherhood of man. He was the son of Joseph Hone, of Harcourt-street, Dublin, with whom he travelled to meet the British Association for the Promotion of Science for many years. He was interred in the family tomb at Mount Jerome Cemetery, Dr. Ledlie performing the funeral service. *Qualis erat, dies suprema indicabit.*

PUNISHMENT OF DEATH.—It is ascertained that those countries where the population are generally characterised by a readiness to resort to violence, are the very countries where the example of capital punishment is most frequently set forth. Thus in Spain, "that wretched land where assassinations abound in the streets, on the mountain sides, on the high roads, in the cottage, and in the palace itself," there were from 1832 to 1837, yearly executions in the proportion of one to 122,000 inhabitants; the proportion in Sweden being one in 172,000; in Ireland, one in 200,000; in England, one in 250,000; in Baden, one in 400,000; in France, one in 470,000; in Norway, one in 750,000; in Austria, one in 840,000; in Prussia, one in 1,700,000; in Bavaria, one in 2,000,000; and in Belgium, since 1830, not one!—*Popular Record.*

NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We beg to acknowledge the receipt of a valuable tract from the Rev. W. Turner, Jun., of which use will be made in the number for May.

"G. H. G," of Aberdelais; "Rev. Edmund Kell;" "E. M. C.;" "Rev. Dr. Beard;" "J. H.;" "E. T. M.;" "B. F.;" Sundries from the Peace Society at Manchester, are thanked for their communications.

We are in possession of letters respecting the Abbé Rongé and his friend Czerski, which we are reluctantly obliged to defer till our next number.

*** Communications for the Editor to be addressed to the care of the Publisher, JOHN MARDON, No. 7, Farringdon Street, London.